

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-14 are pending in this Application.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7-14 are currently amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-14 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, and 4-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0059095 (hereinafter “Cook”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,525 (hereinafter “Johnson”). 1, 2, and 4-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as alleged being directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1, 2, and 4-14 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Cook, Johnson, and the Examiner’s understanding of Microsoft Excel. Applicants respectfully submit that Cook and Johnson and the Examiner’s understanding of Microsoft Excel, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1, 2, and 4-14. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1, 2, and 4-14 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

In particular, Cook, Johnson, and the noted statements about Microsoft Excel fail to disclose or suggest the first or second user interfaces as recited in amended claim 8. As recited, a first user interface is generated having visual elements that enable a salesperson to formulate a search of a central database according to selected ones of a plurality of parameters related to customers in the salesperson’s sales network and the products and/or services offered for sale by the salesperson. As recited, the central database stores customers’ needs information, customers’ install base information, and tagging information for sales opportunities tagged as those products and/or services offered for sale by the salesperson that match the customers’

needs and those products and/or services of the customers' install base of products and/or services offered by the salesperson that the customers are likely to consider purchasing. (See FIGS. 3 and 4 of the Application which are a "search screen" and "enhanced search screen" and associated written description).

As further recited, a second user interface is generated in response to results of the formulated search. As recited, the second user interface is configured according to the search with a tabular worksheet organized across the customers in the salesperson's sales territory and the products and/or services offered for sale by the salesperson. As recited, entries in the tabular worksheet including at least the sales opportunities, the customers' install base of products and/or services, the origination information, and unknown information that identifies where the salesperson should gather additional install base information. (See FIG. 1 of the Application and associated written description).

However, neither the intranet site of Cook, the computerized sales force automation system of Johnson, nor Microsoft Excel, disclose or suggest generating the first or second user interfaces as recited in amended claim 8. Cook merely suggests several forms in FIGS. 2 and 3 for collecting information from sales leads. Moreover, in Paragraph [0045], Cook simply suggests reports can be generated "to tabulate demographic information and product and/or service features and benefit information." The reports that "tabulate" in Cook do not disclose or suggest generating a second user interface recited in amended claim 8 with a tabular worksheet in response to a search formulated using a first user interface as recited in amended claim 8. The addition of the alleged disclosure in Johnson of including side-by-side comparison information or operation of Microsoft Excel does not cure the deficiencies of Cook to disclose or suggest generating the first or second user interfaces as recited in amended claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Cook, Johnson, and the noted statements about Microsoft Excel fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 8. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Cook, Johnson, and the noted statements about Microsoft Excel, and thus, amended claim 8 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 8, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2 and 4-7 and 9-14 that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 8 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

For example, amended claim 11 recites wherein the code configured to generate the first user interface is further configured to render the customer information selectively accessible via the visual elements of the first user interface according to a role of the salesperson defined in the sales hierarchy of the salesperson's employer. As discussed in Paragraphs [0022] and [0023] of the Application, access to sales data may be limited based on setting user's permission levels. As Cook and Johnson fail to disclose the first and second user interfaces recited in amended claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that Cook and Johnson also fail to disclose or suggest rendering customer information selectively accessible via the visual elements of the first user interface according to a role of the salesperson defined in the sales hierarchy of the salesperson's employer as recited.

In another example, Paragraph [0022] discusses that a sales manager may build worksheets for individuals reporting to them. As recited in amended claim 12, code configured to generate the second user interface comprises code configured to generate the second user interface based on the information provided by the salesperson's manager defining the tabular worksheet for the salesperson. As recited in claim 14, code is configured to customize an appearance and ordering of the entries within the provided tabular worksheet based on the information provided by the manager of the salesperson. As Cook and Johnson fail to disclose the first and second user interfaces recited in amended claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that Cook and Johnson also fail to disclose or suggest generate the second user interface based on the information provided by the salesperson's manager defining the tabular worksheet for the salesperson as recited.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-14 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
62251116 v1